

## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <a href="http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content">http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content</a>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

so long as they stop short of an appeal to violence. "So long as freedom of speech or of the press" is lawfully employed, infringing unlawfully upon no private rights, disturbing the public peace to the injury of no innocent person, we must all abide by the provisions of this amendment. The remedy for injury in America is law, operating through the courts, and the ballot. We are in sympathy with legislation designed to overcome recourse to violence.

But here the inconsistency of it all appears. With all our opposition to violence within the State, the instinctive first solution of an international grievance is to appeal to force. Opposition to anarchy within nations, right and natural, is forgotten when the issue is between one nation and another. Issues exist between this country and Mexico, and men and newspapers tell us that the difficulties can be settled only by the sword. "We must clean up Mexico next," we were told over and over again by army officers in France, particularly after the armistice. The World War was the perfect and natural expression of the reign of international anarchy following inevitably a universal reliance upon force.

Our perfectly reasonable opposition to force, indeed to all forms of anarchy on the part of other nations, so far as its internal affairs are concerned, seems childish and irrational and inconsequential when compared with our international incompetencies. There must be a Sterling bill for the nations if we are to attain unto any measure of abiding international self-respect.

## OPEN DIPLOMACY FOR JAPAN

PROGRAMS may come and programs may go, but ideas once let loose in the world pursue their inevitable courses. When on January 8, 1918, President Wilson spoke before the joint session of the two Houses of Congress, addressing himself to the program of the world's peace, a program which he called the "only possible program," he stated as his first demand: "Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view." This requirement enunciated by the President set forth no new idea. It was an expression of a belief increasingly believed in and pleaded for by political writers, especially during the last century. Disraeli, in his vindication of the British Constitution, argued that, "There is no wisdom like frankness." Wherever men have stood for sincerity they have by that act paid a tribute to the principle heading Mr. Wilson's fourteen points. This principle of plain honesty, in no sense hostile to the demands of tact and common sense, will continue to press its undying claim to recognition and acceptance.

Mr. K. Hara, Premier of Japan, speaking to the members of the Japanese Cabinet and sixty-five other notables of Japan, taking the ground that the day of Machiavellian diplomacy and international bargains made in the dark is passed, and that the new era, whether the old-line diplomats of Japan like it or not, of "open covenants" has arrived, and pointing out that Japan is one of the five great Powers charged with the preservation of the peace of the Far East, said:

"The war has brought about the dawn of a new era in the world, and in the future international affairs are to be managed through the co-operation of the Powers. The result is that militarism has been absolutely discarded and the Powers are to work conjointly for the sake of world peace. In every country there are men who find it hard to abandon the old ideas. They remain blind to the general current of the world and strive for the acquisition of rights and interests. It should be remembered, however, that such old-school politics is no longer admissible in the present-day diplomacy.

"There is no doubt that the Peace Treaty will be ratified by the Powers at no distant date, though it is very probable that its operation will result in the cropping up of various new problems. One thing that should be borne in mind, however, is that in the conduct of diplomacy in the future Machiavellianism, which has hitherto been thought by some to be an indispensable requisite of successful diplomacy, will have no place in its display.

"Sincerity and straightforwardness will in future be the guiding principle on which the conduct of diplomacy should be based, although this will be a new phenomenon to a certain class of publicists, to whom the maintenance of international co-operation seemed tantamount to national humiliation."

No nation is more sensitive to the criticisms from other nations than Japan. Her pride alone would account for that. The rise of the young democrats, the revision of policies toward Korea, the explanations of her attitude toward China, this speech of the Premier, all indicate the sweep through Nippon of the breath of liberalism crossing the world. We may watch with interest the effects of Japan's new policy of open diplomacy as she goes about her plans for a "Monroe Doctrine of the East," as she solves her problems arising from her imperialistic party, as she treats the four-Power banking consortium set up for the financing of China, as she acts toward Shantung. The anti-Japanese sentiment in China, in America just now, adds also to the burdens the new policy will have to bear. We may believe with Count Okuma that "The Japan of today is no longer the Japan of Japan, but the Japan of the world." But, better, we may believe that out of the new democracy characteristic of the new education and the new statesmanship in Japan, beginning with the Meiji Era, we shall yet agree with Jchitaro Shimizu, speaking in Washington before the war: "To say that Japan is a warlike nation, I repeat it, is a grievous mistake."

## THE PATHOS OF OUR CHALLENGE

Acolph Lorenz, the well-known surgeon, has told us of 2,000,000 people in Austria threatened now with death from cold and starvation.

Monsieur Clemenceau, in his note to the Austrian delegation at St. Germain, charged that the Austrian peoples must be expected to "share the responsibility" for the war precipitated by the former Austro-Hungarian Government because they had favored the war throughout, doing nothing up to the final breakdown on the battlefield to dissociate themselves from the policy of their government and its allies.

We are in receipt of a letter from the Austrian League of Nations-Union, pleading, in reply to M. Clemenceau, that they have been "creatures of unfortunate circumstances" and subjected to "forces over which we had no control." These Austrian gentlemen protest that the Austrian peoples have not "been fervent adherents of the war during its whole term"; but that "as in all other countries the holders of the civil and military power succeeded indeed for a short space of time to maintain the outward semblance of enthusiasm of large masses for the war. It was rather the feeling of resigned fulfillment of duty which animated the people. During the war the number of the partisans of peace steadily increased. But whatever could be done by the strictest censure of the press, by the gagging of Parliament, and by the military dictature, in order to suppress every true manifestation of public feeling, has been done for over four years on the largest scale. The passionate ill-will of the people which had slumbered in them during the war came to a violent eruption after the collapse of the military machinery. It turned itself against the war and its authors. On the other hand, as long as the struggle went on every attempt to rouse numerous citizens to a public demonstration in favor of peace was doomed to certain failure, because every country engaged in this dreadful war stigmatized such attempt as an act of high treason fomented by the enemy, and suppressed it without mercy."

"Of all the peoples, however, the Austrian people seem to be least answerable for the deeds of their government.

. . In fact, the Austrian people were uninformed and without any political judgment. The organized

propaganda of the press found no difficulty in creating hostile feeling by distorting truth, a travesty to which every belligerent Power unfortunately stooped. . . .

"The suffering our innocent peoples had to sustain the last five years ought not to be increased by their having to atone for the sins of the principle of might which prevailed hitherto in international relations.

"The Austrian nation is now in greater need than ever of being led with good-will. An inculpation which hurts its sense of justice cannot but prolong indefinitely and intensify the feelings of aversion held by all nations against the victors. It is not by such treatment of the defeated nations that the longed-for goal of a lasting peace may be attained."

The letter proceeds to point out that the Austrian people had most warmly greeted Mr. Wilson's principles of peace, and that now public opinion in their country has been cruelly disappointed. And yet they are looking for a stable and lasting improvement in future international relations, a coming together and a reorganization. They plead that their task may not be made impossible. They ask a just judgment based on the same standard as that applied to the guilt of all belligerent nations. The letter closes with these words: "But in this case you might be perhaps compelled to acquit all the nations and solely to condemn the imperialistic principle of might, unfortunately still adopted by the governments and daily creating new appalling dangers for the peace and civilization of the whole world."

We have quoted these measured words from this interesting letter because they set forth a point of view which we may well ponder upon. The Central Powers of Europe have been unquestionably defeated in a vast and devastating world war. This is proved by the terms of the armistice, by the treaty of peace, by the logic of facts, and by the acknowledgment of the fallen. With the experience of the last five years vividly in mind, with a major part of Germany's war equipment in the hands of the French, with the abolition of the German navy an accomplished fact, with the great British navy stronger than ever, with the peoples everywhere sick and tired of war, all talk of the reopening of hostilities, even from the lips of Marshal Foch, is stuff and nonsense.

The challenge of the United States and of the nations associated with us in the World War is to bring about a just and lasting peace. If we have been faithless to our promise which pledged to the Germans and their Allies the nation's honor to make peace upon Mr. Wilson's fourteen points, and there is no doubt of our faithlessness in this respect, it is our duty to go about the business of making amends. If we have compromised our principles, violated the laws of humanity, acted contrary to the teachings of history, disregarded justice, played fast and